

## REMARKS

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. (US 6,778,244). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the features of the plurality of first slits formed on the first substrate on the side that faces the liquid crystals. The plurality of first electrodes comprise substantially only a plurality of first slits extending substantially parallel with respect to each other in a plurality of pixel regions. The present invention also includes a second electrode formed on the second substrate on the side that faces the liquid crystals. The second electrode comprises substantially only a plurality of second slits intersecting with and extending in a direction substantially at right angles of the first slits in the plurality of pixel regions, as viewed in a direction perpendicular to the substrate surface. This arrangement is shown in Figs. 2 and 3 of the application.

The Song et al. '244 reference discloses first and second apertures 211 and 212 extending in transverse and longitudinal directions and being formed in an electrode 11 on an upper substrate 10. A cross-shaped apertures 216 and 217, including first and second portions 216 and 217, extending in the transverse and longitudinal directions are formed in an electrode 21 on a lower substrate 20. See column 5, lines 55-61 and Figs. 3 and 4. In other words, the electrode 11 includes the apertures 211 and 212 which extend at approximately right angles of each other, and the electrode 21 includes the apertures 216 and 217 which also extend at approximately right angles of each other.

In contrast, the claimed plurality of first electrodes comprise substantially only a plurality of first slits extending substantially parallel with respect to each other in the plurality of pixel regions. Song et al. '244 does not disclose (or suggest) at least this feature of the present invention. For this reason, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7 are allowable over Song et al. '244.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. '244. Applicant traverses this rejection for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, from which this claim depends, and because of the additional features that it recites.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

July 20, 2005

Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\1324\68597\946892.DOC